



MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
3811 VALLEY CENTRE DRIVE  
SUITE 500  
SAN DIEGO CA 92130-2332

**COPY MAILED**

**JUN 08 2005**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of	:
Eliezer Masliah et al	: DECISION ON PETITION
Application No. 09/933,640	: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)
Filed: August 20, 2001	:
Attorney Docket No. 6627-PA1071	:

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), filed December 22, 2004, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§120 and 365(c)) for the benefit of the prior-filed PCT application set forth in the concurrently filed Application Data Sheet (ADS).

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant petition does not comply with item (1)

37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) requires that any nonprovisional application claiming the benefit of one or more prior-filed copending nonprovisional applications must contain or be amended to contain a reference to each such prior-filed application, identifying it by application number (consisting of

the series code and serial number) and indicating the relationship of the applications. The relationship between the applications is whether the subject application is a continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part of a prior-filed nonprovisional application. An example of a proper benefit claim is: "This application is a continuation of Application No. 10/---, filed---." A benefit claim that merely states: "This application claims the benefit of Application No. 10/---, filed---," does not comply with 37 CFR 1.72(a)(2)(i) since the proper relationship, which includes the type of continuing application, is not stated. Also, the status of each nonprovisional parent application (if it is patented or abandoned) should also be indicated, following the filing date of the parent nonprovisional application. See MPEP Section 201.11, Rev. 2, May 2004, Reference to Prior Application. The ADS filed December 22, 2004 fails to state the relationship of PCT Application No. PCT/US01/05569, filed February 20, 2001, to the above application.

Accordingly, before the petition under 37 CFR § 1.78(a)(3) can be granted, a renewed petition under 37 CFR § 1.78(a)(3) and a substitute amendment (complying with 37 CFR 1.121) stating the relationship of the prior-filed PCT application to the above application is required.


Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:                      Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    Post Office Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                      Customer Service Window  
                                    Mail Stop Petitions  
                                    Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax:                        (703) 872-9306  
                                    ATTN: Office of Petitions

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3208.



Karen Creasy  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy